

### **Remark**

The Examiner is thanked for the clarity and conciseness of the Office Action and for the citation of the references, which have been studied with interest and care.

Claims 1-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter that was not adequately described in the specification. Claims 1-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly obvious in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,900,916, issued to Pauley in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,828,945, issued to Klosterman.

Applicant has amended claims 1-16, 19-26, and 29-39 and added claims 41-48 to more distinctly claim that which Applicant regards as the invention. No Claims have been canceled. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 1-48 are pending in the present application. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in light of the amendments and remarks herein.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claims 1 and 6 have been amended. As the language forming the basis of the rejection has been removed, the rejection is moot.

Claims 1-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Pauley (U.S. Patent No. 5,633,865) and Klosterman (U.S. Patent No. 5,828,945).

Amended independent claims 1 and 6 recite, in part, "receiving a first user-specified show selection; displaying a first plurality of sources available for providing the first user-specified show selection; receiving a first user-specified source selection from

the first plurality of sources; displaying the first user-specified show selection provided by the first user-specified source selection.”

Amended independent claims 16 and 26 recite, in part, “the programming data associated with a first user-specified show selection provided by a first user-specified source selection from a first plurality of sources displayed for providing the first user-specified show selection;

Amended independent claim 41 recites, in part, “in response to receiving a user-specified selection, displaying a plurality of sources available for providing the user-specified selection.”

Amended independent claim 46 recites, in part, “in response to receiving the plurality of user-specified selections, displaying a plurality of sources available for providing each of the plurality of user-specified selections.”

The present invention displays to the user a list of all sources available for providing the user-specified show selection. If a user specifies that he wants to watch, for instance, “Show A”, an embodiment of a system according to the invention hooked up to cable, DSS and local programming could then prompt the user in a *channel source selection menu* (Figure 4) with a list showing that “Show A” is being provided on Channel 4 from local programming, channel 92 from cable programming and channel 125 from DSS programming, etc.

In contrast, Pauley fails to teach or suggest that a user may select a source from a plurality of sources capable of providing a user-specified show selection. Pauley teaches a system capable of displaying a main picture and a PIP (picture-in-picture). Each of the two pictures may be supplied from various sources, such as a VCR, DVD, cable, etc.

However, Pauley's system is quite distinct from the present invention. In Pauley, a sequential list may be browsed where each item in the list rotates (depending on if the Pauley system is in preview or review mode) through the two picture displays. The sequential list is a list of channels or shows. Each of the channels or shows in the list is provided by a specific and designated source for that item in the sequential list, but there is no teaching of the user selecting a source for a show where the show is provided by multiple sources as taught in the present invention. For instance, the user can scroll through the Pauley list until he sees "Show A" on the screen, which he can then select and watch.

Consequently, Pauley fails to disclose or teach "displaying a first plurality of sources available for providing the first user-specified show selection; receiving a first user-specified source selection from the first plurality of sources; displaying the first user-specified show selection provided by the first user-specified source selection" as required by amended independent claims 1 and 6.

Klosterman also fails to teach the claimed invention. Klosterman is concerned with merging schedule information provided by multiple sources into one schedule. Then, when a user selects a program or channel, "the system (10) then carries out an automatic switching/tuning such that the required source device (26, 28, 30 or 34) is input to the destination device (22), and a tuner is then tuned to the selected program's channel (52)." (Abstract) There is no teaching or suggestion in Klosterman that a plurality of sources is displayed in response to a user-specified show selection.

Pauley and Klosterman, alone and in combination, fail to disclose a system whereby a user may choose a show or channel and then choose between a plurality of

sources that provide that show or channel as disclosed in amended independent claims 1, 6, 16, 26, 41 and 46.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that amended independent claims 1, 6, 16, 26, 41 and 46 as well as their respective amended dependent claims 2-5, 7-15, 17-25, 27-40, 42-45 and 47-48 are patentable over Pauley in view of Klosterman.


Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections have been overcome and the claims are now in condition for allowance. Allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666. If a telephone interview would in any way expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (303) 740-1980.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: February 21, 2001

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Libby N. Ho  
Reg. No. 46,774

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026  
(303) 740-1980